

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,846	10/23/2003	Donald K. Jones	CRD5035CIP1	6702
27777	7590 09/29/2006		EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA			WEBB, SARAH K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW BRUNS	WICK, NJ 08933-7003	3731		
			DATE MAILED: 09/29/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/691,846	JONES ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Sarah K. Webb	3731				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
Period for Reply		·				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH c, cause the application to become ABAN	TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 S	eptember 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		·				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers	•					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
,	xammer. Note the attached C	Since Action of format 10-132.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list. 	ts have been received. ts have been received in App ority documents have been re u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date. <u>7/27/06</u> . rmal Patent Application				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-3 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,702,418 to Ravenscroft in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,168,618 to Frantzen.

Ravenscroft discloses a stent delivery catheter that includes an elongate core member with proximal and distal cylindrical members (23) on the core (17). As shown more clearly in Figures 2,3, and 6, Ravenscroft explains that the cylindrical members (23) define a gap within which anchor members (20B) on a stent (20) are interlocked (column 6, lines 1-21). This configuration allows the stent to be pulled back into the outer sheath (24) after partial deployment (column 4, lines 30-36). Ravenscroft explains that the sheath (24) keeps the self-expanding stent (20) compressed onto the core so that the anchors are interlocked with the cylinders (23) (see column 6), and fails to include actuatable retaining rings.

Frantzen discloses another self-expanding stent delivery system that includes a self-expanding prosthesis (10) compressed onto an elongated core (22) member.

Frantzen teaches that the system can be configured to release the rings in any desired order to prevent longitudinal displacement (column 1, lines 61-66 and column 5, lines 30-37). Frantzen teaches that the delivery system can include a sheath (column 2,

Application/Control Number: 10/691,846

Art Unit: 3731

line 3). In lines 46-61 of column 4, Frantzen explains that the retaining rings (30) are severed by current supplied to electrode lead wires (32) to allow the self-expanding prosthesis (10) to expand. The rings remain attached the catheter (51) after they are severed (column 5, lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include actuatable retaining rings in the Ravenscroft delivery device, as Frantzen teaches that the actuatable rings increase the level of control over release of a vascular prosthesis so that proper placement can be achieved.

Page 3

Regarding the new requirement for the anchor member to be at an end of the stent, the anchor members positioned in the gap are near the proximal end of the stent. The stent also has anchor members located at each end of the stent. These anchors are capable of being located within the gap between the cylindrical members. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to place the anchor members at the end of the stent within the gap, because applicant has not disclosed that this placement provides an advantage or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected applicant's invention to perform equally well with anchor members located distal to the proximal end, because Ravenscroft discloses that this placement of the anchor performs the function of locking the stent with the introducer so that it can be repositioned.

2. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft in view of Frantzen, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,607,539 to Hayashi et al.

Art Unit: 3731

The modified Ravenscroft device fails to form the rings from material that melts in response to heat supplied by heating elements. Hayashi discloses another stent delivery system with retaining rings that are severed when electrical current is supplied to the them in a particular order (column 1, line 65-column 2). Hayashi teaches that the rings can be formed of material that melts and the actuation mechanisms are resistive heating elements (column 3, lines 43-53). Since the actuation mechanisms of Frantzen and Hayashi perform the same function of retaining a stent in a contracted state and releasing the stent upon supply of electrical current, the mechanisms are considered to be functional equivalents. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use heat actuation instead of electrolytic erosion for severing the rings of the modified Ravenscroft device, as taught by Hayashi, as this is simply a substitution of functionally equivalent mechanisms.

3. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ravenscroft in view of Frantzen and Hayashi, as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,277,126 to Barry et al.

Ravenscroft, as modified by Frantzen and Hayashi above, includes all the limitations of claims 6-8 except for the retaining ring being a hot melt polymer filament. Hayashi does state that the retaining rings should be made from suture material (column 4, line 26), which includes many types of polymer filaments. Barry discloses another type of delivery system, in which an electric current is supplied to a resistive heating element. The heat is used to sever a coupling, thereby releasing a vascular implant. Here, Barry teaches that the coupling material can be a hot melt adhesive (which is inherently a polymer), because this type of material softens and

yields when exposed to heat. (See column 4, lines 29 – 40.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the retaining filaments of Hayashi from a hot melt polymeric material, as taught by Barry, as this material is suitable for forming retaining elements that yield with the application of heat in a vascular implant delivery system.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Ravenscroft would be inoperable if the anchors at the end of the stent were placed within the gap between the cylindrical members. The stent includes anchoring structures along its entire length. Since the anchors at the end of the stent have the same structure as the other anchors, they are capable of being placed within the gap. The only modification would be moving the stent to a more distal location on the introducer. This modification would not cause the device to be inoperable. One of ordinary skill in the art would be capable of altering the placement of a stent on the introducer and determining the optimum placement of retaining rings on the modified Ravenscroft device.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah K. Webb whose telephone number is (571) 272-4706. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anhtuan T. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-4963. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/691,846 Page 6

Art Unit: 3731

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SKW 9/22/06 SKW

Mon W. Woo

JULIAN W. WOO
PRIMARY EXAMINER